

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 9, and 11-12 are amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Formal Matters

Notice of References Cited

Applicant notes that United States Patent No. 5,907,197 to Faulk and United States Patent No. 5,961,619 to Voloshin were used in the Office Action to reject certain claims of the present application but were not included in the Notice of References Cited. Applicant respectfully requests that these two patents be added to the Notice of References Cited.

II. Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,160,728 to Peterson et al. (hereinafter “Peterson”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, Claim 1 recites that an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices comprises a power output cord connected in series to the integrated power input connector, the power output cord configured to mate directly with a power input connector on a first powered device and configured to deliver alternating current to the first powered device.

Peterson does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 1. In contrast, Peterson describes a dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle having input terminals for receiving AC, an AC-to-DC converter that generates the low-voltage DC from the high-voltage AC, one or more DC output sockets to provide the low-voltage DC, and a standard AC socket that provides the high voltage AC. Alternatively, Peterson describes a dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle having

input terminals for receiving AC and DC and output sockets for AC and DC such that the AC and DC are simply passed through the electrical receptacle. Neither of these embodiments described by Peterson is analogous to the apparatus recited by claim 1 because Peterson fails to teach or suggest that the dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle includes a power output cord configured to mate directly with a power input connector on a first powered device and to deliver alternating current (AC) to the first powered device. Instead, Peterson describes that the dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle includes a standard AC socket that provides AC to a plug that may be inserted into the AC socket, without suggesting that the dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle includes an output cord configured to mate with a plug of a first powered device and deliver AC to the first powered device. The Office Action notes that Peterson describes a cord attached to the AC socket, but Applicant respectfully asserts that Peterson does not describe or even mention such a cord configured to mate with a plug or power input connector of a first powered device and to deliver AC to the first powered device.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the teaching of Peterson. Since claim 2 depends from claim 1 and recites further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the teaching of Peterson does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claim 2. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3-6

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of United States Patent No. 5,563,782 to Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the teaching of Peterson. Since claims 3-6 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson and Chen does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 3-6. In particular, Chen does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson, nor

was Chen cited for that purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of United States Patent No. 5,907,197 to Faulk (hereinafter “Faulk”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the teaching of Peterson. Since claims 7-10 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson and Faulk does not make obvious Applicant’s claimed invention as embodied in claims 7-10. In particular, Faulk does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson, nor was Faulk cited for that purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 13

Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of United States Patent No. 5,910,750 to Harada et al. (hereinafter “Harada”) or in view of United States Patent No. 6,664,758 to Yang (hereinafter “Yang”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the teaching of Peterson. Since claims 11 and 13 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada and the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang do not make obvious Applicant’s claimed invention as embodied in claims 11 and 13. In particular, neither Harada nor Yang overcomes the aforementioned deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 12

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Harada and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,961,619 to Voloshin (hereinafter “Voloshin”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the teaching of Peterson. Since claim 12 depends from claim 1 and recites further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson, Harada, and Voloshin does not make obvious Applicant’s claimed invention as embodied in claim 12. In particular, neither Harada nor Voloshin overcomes the aforementioned deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson, nor was Harada or Voloshin cited for that purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 22

Claims 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Harada or in view of Yang. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 recites that an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices comprises a control circuit mounted within the housing, the circuit operative to receive an input signal and, based on the input signal, to allow or prevent the flow of alternating current to the power output cord.

Peterson does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 14. On the contrary, Peterson describes a dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle having input terminals for receiving AC, an AC-to-DC converter that generates the low-voltage DC from the high-voltage AC, one or more DC output sockets to provide the low-voltage DC, and a standard AC socket that provides the high voltage AC. Alternatively, Peterson describes a dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle having input terminals for receiving AC and DC and output sockets for AC and DC such that the AC and DC are simply passed through the electrical receptacle. Neither of these embodiments described by Peterson is analogous to the apparatus recited by claim 14 because Peterson fails to teach or suggest that the electrical receptacle includes a control circuit operative to receive an input signal and allow or prevent the flow of AC to the AC socket based on the input signal.

The Office Action notes that Peterson does not disclose the recitation of a control circuit and relies on the teaching of Harada to allegedly cure the deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson. However, like Peterson, Harada does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 14. In contrast, Harada describes a control device for reducing power consumption while an electronic device is inactivated including an AC adapter for converting power voltage to a predetermined DC voltage and a battery, both for supplying voltage to a functional circuit such as a PC or a cellular phone. Harada describes that the DC voltage from the AC adapter and battery is supplied to the functional circuit via a DC/DC converter which converts the received DC voltage from the AC adapter and battery to a proper DC voltage before supplying the DC voltage to the functional circuit. Harada further describes that voltage from the AC adapter and battery is supplied to the DC/DC converter via a switch circuit having a switch and a main switch. Harada also describes that the switch circuit is further connected to a control circuit.

When the switch of the switch circuit is turned on, Harada describes that the switch circuit becomes conductive and a start signal is sent to the control circuit, which determines whether the start signal is at a voltage higher than a predetermined voltage. If the control circuit determines that the start signal is at a higher voltage, then Harada describes that the control circuit judges that the functional circuit should be activated and outputs a command signal to activate the DC/DC converter. Simultaneously, Harada describes that the control circuit sends an actuating signal to the switch circuit which renders the main switch of the switch circuit conductive, allowing the DC voltage from the AC adapter and battery to be supplied to the DC/DC converter. On the other hand, Harada describes that if the control circuit determines that the start signal is not at a higher voltage than a predetermined voltage, then the control circuit judges that there is no need to start the functional circuit and does not output a command signal for activating the DC/DC converter.

This is not analogous to the apparatus recited by claim 14 because Harada fails to teach or describe that the control circuit is operative to allow or prevent the flow of alternating current (AC) to the DC/DC converter. Instead, Harada describes that the control circuit is operative to allow and prevent the flow of *DC* to the DC/DC converter,

without suggesting that the control circuit is operative to control the flow of *AC* to the DC/DC converter. In fact, Harada fails to teach or suggest any selectable control over a flow of *AC* because the flow received from both the AC adapter and the battery is DC.

Alternatively, the Office Action relies on the teaching of Yang to allegedly cure the above-identified deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson. However, like Peterson and Harada, Yang does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 14. On the contrary, Yang describes a universal power adapter having a DC voltage converter adapted to convert input current into the desired voltage level and then transmit the voltage-converted input current to a power/signal jack which connects to a charging connector. Yang further describes that the universal power adapter includes a feedback control voltage output circuit adapted to drive the DC voltage converter to output a predetermined voltage. This is not analogous to the apparatus recited by claim 14 because Yang fails to teach or suggest that the feedback control voltage output circuit is operative to allow or prevent the flow of alternating current (*AC*) to the charging connector. Instead, Yang describes that the feedback control voltage output circuit is operative to drive the DC voltage converter to output a predetermined *DC* voltage, without suggesting that the feedback control voltage output circuit is operative to allow or prevent the flow of *AC* to the charging connector.

For at least these reasons, claim 14 is allowable over the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada as well as the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang. Since claim 22 depends from claim 14 and recites further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada as well as the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang do not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claim 22 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-16 and 20-21

Claims 15-16 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Peterson in view of Faulk. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 14 is allowable over the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada as well as the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang.

Since claims 15-16 and 20-21 depend from claim 14 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson and Faulk does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 15-16 and 20-21. In particular, Faulk does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada or the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang, nor was Faulk cited for that purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-19

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Harada and further in view of Voloshin. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 14 is allowable over the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada. Since claims 17-19 depend from claim 14 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson, Harada, and Voloshin does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 17-19. In particular, Voloshin does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada, nor was Voloshin cited for that purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 23

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Harada or Peterson in view of Yang. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 23 recites that an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices comprises a control circuit mounted within the housing, the circuit operative to receive an input signal and receive power from the power supply, and based on the input signal, to allow or prevent the flow of alternating current to the integrated power output connector.

Peterson does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 23. On the contrary, Peterson describes a dual mode

AC/DC electrical receptacle having input terminals for receiving AC, an AC-to-DC converter that generates the low-voltage DC from the high-voltage AC, one or more DC output sockets to provide the low-voltage DC, and a standard AC socket that provides the high voltage AC. Alternatively, Peterson describes a dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle having input terminals for receiving AC and DC and output sockets for AC and DC such that the AC and DC are simply passed through the electrical receptacle. Neither of these embodiments is analogous to the apparatus recited by claim 23 because Peterson fails to teach or suggest that the electrical receptacle includes a control circuit operative to receive power from the AC-to-DC converter and to receive an input signal and allow or prevent the flow of AC to the AC socket based on the input signal.

The Office Action notes that Peterson does not disclose the recitation of a control circuit and relies on the teaching of Harada to allegedly cure the deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson. However, like Peterson, Harada does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 23. In contrast, Harada describes a control device for reducing power consumption while an electronic device is inactivated including an AC adapter for converting power voltage to a predetermined DC voltage and a battery, both for supplying voltage to a functional circuit such as a PC or a cellular phone. Harada describes that the DC voltage from the AC adapter and battery is supplied to the functional circuit via a DC/DC converter which converts the received DC voltage from the AC adapter and battery to a proper DC voltage before supplying the DC voltage to the functional circuit. Harada further describes that voltage from the AC adapter and battery is supplied to the DC/DC converter via a switch circuit having a switch and a main switch. Harada also describes that the switch circuit is further connected to a control circuit.

When the switch of the switch circuit is turned on, Harada describes that the switch circuit becomes conductive and a start signal is sent to the control circuit, which determines whether the start signal is at a voltage higher than a predetermined voltage. If the control circuit determines that the start signal is at a higher voltage, then Harada describes that the control circuit judges that the functional circuit should be activated and outputs a command signal to activate the DC/DC converter. Simultaneously, Harada describes that the control circuit sends an actuating signal to the switch circuit which

renders the main switch of the switch circuit conductive, allowing the DC voltage from the AC adapter and battery to be supplied to the DC/DC converter. On the other hand, Harada describes that if the control circuit determines that the start signal is not at a higher voltage than a predetermined voltage, then the control circuit judges that there is no need to start the functional circuit and does not output a command signal for activating the DC/DC converter.

This is not analogous to the apparatus recited by claim 23 because Harada fails to teach or describe that the control circuit is operative to allow or prevent the flow of alternating current (AC) to the DC/DC converter. Instead, Harada describes that the control circuit is operative to allow and prevent the flow of *DC* to the DC/DC converter, without suggesting that the control circuit is operative to control the flow of *AC* to the DC/DC converter. In fact, Harada fails to teach or suggest any selectable control over a flow of AC because the flow received from both the AC adapter and the battery is DC.

Alternatively, the Office Action relies on the teaching of Yang to allegedly cure the above-identified deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson. However, like Peterson and Harada, Yang does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 23. On the contrary, Yang describes a universal power adapter having a DC voltage converter adapted to convert input current into the desired voltage level and then transmit the voltage-converted input current to a power/signal jack which connects to a charging connector. Yang further describes that the universal power adapter includes a feedback control voltage output circuit adapted to drive the DC voltage converter to output a predetermined voltage. This is not analogous to the apparatus recited by claim 23 because Yang fails to teach or suggest that the feedback control voltage output circuit is operative to allow or prevent the flow of alternating current (AC) to the charging connector. Instead, Yang describes that the feedback control voltage output circuit is operative to drive the DC voltage converter to output a predetermined *DC* voltage, without suggesting that the feedback control voltage output circuit is operative to allow or prevent the flow of *AC* to the charging connector.

For at least these reasons, claim 23 is allowable over the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada as well as the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 24 and 27-28

Claims 24 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Faulk. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 23 is allowable over the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada as well as the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang. Since claims 24 and 27-28 depend from claim 23 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson and Faulk does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 24 and 27-28. In particular, Faulk does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada or the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang, nor was Faulk cited for that purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-26

Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Harada and further in view of Voloshin. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 23 is allowable over the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada. Since claims 25-26 depend from claim 23 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson, Harada, and Voloshin does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 25-26. In particular, Voloshin does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada, nor was Voloshin cited for that purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 29 and 35

Claims 29 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Harada or Peterson in view of Yang. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 29 recites that an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices comprises a control circuit mounted within the housing, the circuit operative to receive an input signal having only a high or low value and receive power from the power supply, and based on whether the input signal has a high or low value, to allow or prevent the flow of alternating current to the integrated power output cord.

Peterson does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 29. On the contrary, Peterson describes a dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle having input terminals for receiving AC, an AC-to-DC converter that generates the low-voltage DC from the high-voltage AC, one or more DC output sockets to provide the low-voltage DC, and a standard AC socket that provides the high voltage AC. Alternatively, Peterson describes a dual mode AC/DC electrical receptacle having input terminals for receiving AC and DC and output sockets for AC and DC such that the AC and DC are simply passed through the electrical receptacle. Neither of these embodiments is analogous to the apparatus recited by claim 29 because Peterson fails to teach or suggest that the electrical receptacle includes a control circuit operative to receive power from the AC-to-DC converter and to receive an input signal having only a high or low value and allow or prevent the flow of AC to the AC socket based on whether the input signal has a high or low value. In fact, Peterson does not describe anything for controlling AC to the AC socket.

The Office Action notes that Peterson does not disclose the recitation of a control circuit and relies on the teaching of Harada to allegedly cure the deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson. However, like Peterson, Harada does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 29. In contrast, Harada describes a control device for reducing power consumption while an electronic device is inactivated including an AC adapter for converting power voltage to a predetermined DC voltage and a battery, both for supplying voltage to a functional circuit such as a PC or a cellular phone. Harada describes that the DC voltage from the AC adapter and battery is supplied to the functional circuit via a DC/DC converter which converts the received DC voltage from the AC adapter and battery to a proper DC voltage before supplying the DC voltage to the functional circuit. Harada further describes that voltage from the AC adapter and battery is supplied to the DC/DC converter via a switch

circuit having a switch and a main switch. Harada also describes that the switch circuit is further connected to a control circuit.

When the switch of the switch circuit is turned on, Harada describes that the switch circuit becomes conductive and a start signal is sent to the control circuit, which determines whether the start signal is at a voltage higher than a predetermined voltage. If the control circuit determines that the start signal is at a higher voltage, then Harada describes that the control circuit judges that the functional circuit should be activated and outputs a command signal to activate the DC/DC converter. Simultaneously, Harada describes that the control circuit sends an actuating signal to the switch circuit which renders the main switch of the switch circuit conductive, allowing the DC voltage from the AC adapter and battery to be supplied to the DC/DC converter. On the other hand, Harada describes that if the control circuit determines that the start signal is not at a higher voltage than a predetermined voltage, then the control circuit judges that there is no need to start the functional circuit and does not output a command signal for activating the DC/DC converter.

This is not analogous to the apparatus recited by claim 29 because Harada fails to teach or describe that the control circuit is operative to allow or prevent the flow of alternating current (AC) to the DC/DC converter. Instead, Harada describes that the control circuit is operative to allow and prevent the flow of *DC* to the DC/DC converter, without suggesting that the control circuit is operative to control the flow of *AC* to the DC/DC converter. In fact, Harada fails to teach or suggest any selectable control over a flow of AC because the flow received from both the AC adapter and the battery is DC.

Alternatively, the Office Action relies on the teaching of Yang to allegedly cure the above-identified deficiencies of the teaching of Peterson. However, like Peterson and Harada, Yang does not teach or suggest an apparatus for providing power to one or more devices as recited by claim 29. On the contrary, Yang describes a universal power adapter having a DC voltage converter adapted to convert input current into the desired voltage level and then transmit the voltage-converted input current to a power/signal jack which connects to a charging connector. Yang further describes that the universal power adapter includes a feedback control voltage output circuit adapted to drive the DC voltage converter to output a predetermined voltage. This is not analogous to the apparatus

recited by claim 29 because Yang fails to teach or suggest that the feedback control voltage output circuit is operative to allow or prevent the flow of alternating current (AC) to the charging connector based on whether an input signal has a high or low value. Instead, Yang describes that the feedback control voltage output circuit is operative to drive the DC voltage converter to output a predetermined *DC* voltage, without suggesting that the feedback control voltage output circuit is operative to allow or prevent the flow of *AC* to the charging connector based on whether an input signal has a high or low value.

For at least these reasons, claim 29 is allowable over the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada as well as the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang. Since claim 35 depends from claim 29 and recites further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada as well as the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang do not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claim 35 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 30 and 33-34

Claims 30 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Faulk. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 29 is allowable over the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada as well as the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang. Since claims 30 and 33-34 depend from claim 29 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson and Faulk does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 30 and 33-34. In particular, Faulk does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada or the combined teaching of Peterson and Yang, nor was Faulk cited for that purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 31-32

Claim 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Harada and further in view of Voloshin. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.


For at least the reasons given above, claim 29 is allowable over the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada. Since claims 31-32 depend from claim 29 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Peterson, Harada, and Voloshin does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 31-32. In particular, Voloshin does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of the combined teaching of Peterson and Harada, nor was Voloshin cited for that purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicant asserts that the pending claims 1-35 are in condition for allowance. Applicant further asserts that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-35 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicant's attorney at 404.522.1100.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC



Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251

Date: January 30, 2006

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC
P.O. Box 2825
Atlanta, Georgia 30301
Telephone: 404.522.1100

